

\*FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

2013 FEB 20 PM 2:25

Kim K. Sumner \*  
1535 W. main St, Apt 4  
Westminster, MD 21157 \*

(Full name and address of the plaintiff)

Plaintiff(s) Pro Se  
Lisiet

VS. \*

MD Juorany / District Court  
of Maryland, District 1 \*  
5800 WABASH AVE  
Baltimore, MD 21215 \*

(Full name and address of the defendant(s))

Defendant(s) \*

\*\*\*\*\*

**COMPLAINT**

1. Jurisdiction in this case is based on:

☐ Diversity (none of the defendants are residents of the state where plaintiff is a resident)

☒ Federal question (suit is based upon a federal statute or provision of the United States Constitution)

☐ Other (explain) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. The facts of this case are:

See Attachment 1

Attachment 1

2. Facts of the Case:


The Maryland Judiciary violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (sexual Harassment) by having a history of protecting the Administrative Clerk of Baltimore City, District 1. A man in power with powerful friends, but a man with a well known and documented record of being vulgar around women and being a sexual predator of the women who work under him.

The above behavior has been condoned and has continued for many years, while the Maryland Judiciary either looked the other way, or when complaints were filed, applied minimal punitive actions against the Administrative Clerk. Because of the Maryland Judiciary's failing to protect its women and blatant disregard to applying measures of the Title VII to protect against violation, in 2010 I was subject to defaming and degrading pornography by dvds given to me by the Administrative Clerk; I was also asked to look up men's underwear sites by the Administrative Clerk; I was subjected to vulgar and degrading terminology regarding women in general by the Administrative Clerk.


I reported this behavior to my supervisor and she protected the Administrative Clerk. I filed an internal complaint and the outcome was a 30 day suspension. I am still working with the Administrative Clerk and his management team (who protect him); I consider myself in an isolated hostile environment.

I have looked for legal representation since 2011 when I received the official outcome of my complaint; I have been to Legal Aid and also to the ACLU.

It is my belief that because of where I work, who I work for, who this complaint is against and the very nature of this complaint, that I cannot even get a lawyer to help me. I am filing this Pro Se Litigant and will continue to look for legal representation



Signature



Date

3. The relief I want the court to order is:

☒ Damages in the amount of: LAST time, been a mental anguish

☒ An injunction ordering: Removal of Administrative Clerk

☐ Other (explain) \_\_\_\_\_

02-20-2013  
(Date)

Kim K. Sumner  
(Signature)  
1533 W. main St  
APT 1  
Westminster, MD 21157  
410-212-4516  
(Printed name, address and phone number of Plaintiff)

#### Privacy Rules and Judicial Conference Privacy Policy

Under the E-Government Act and Judicial Conference policy, any paper filed with the court should not contain an individual's social security number, full birth date, or home address; the full name of person known to be a minor; or a complete financial account number. These rules address the privacy concerns resulting from public access to electronic case files.